

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 11 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-5 and 7-13 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-15 stand under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,325 (King et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,366 (Yamakawa et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, detecting a minimum pixel level value in a checked region of a selected R,G,B component [of an RGB signal].

Independent claim 4 recites, inter alia, a minimum value detector detecting a minimum pixel level value in a particular region of a selected R,G,B component input, the selected R,G,B component being an R, a G, or a B component of received R,G,B signals.

Independent claim 7 recites, inter alia, detecting a minimum pixel level value of an R,G,B, component selected from received R,G,B signals, the selected R,G,B, component being an R, a G, or a B component of received R,G,B signals.

Independent claim 11 recites, inter alia, an abnormal state detector detecting an abnormal video signal in an R,G,B component selected from among received R,G,B signals based on a comparison of a detected pixel level value of the R,G,B component and a predetermined value, the selected R,G,B component being an R, a G, or a B component of received R,G,B signals.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the asserted combination does not teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11.

It is to be appreciated that Applicant has amended the claims to further clarify the previously recited definition of "selected R,G,B signal" as an R, a G, or a B component of an R,G,B, signal.

The Office Action acknowledges that the primary citation to King et al. does not disclose the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11. (Office Action, page 3). Nonetheless, the Office Action contends that the secondary citation to Yamakawa et al. provides the necessary disclosure of this feature. This latter contention is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts, citing Col. 14, lines 27-31, that Yamakawa et al. teaches the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11. (Office Action, page 3). However, the cited portion of Yamakawa et al. merely discusses adjusting the color balance of a scanned image at points selected by a user. Absent from Yamakawa et al. is any teaching or suggestion of checking a portion of a selected R, G, or B component of an RGB signal. Instead, Yamakawa et al. expressly teaches that colors of a user selected image are calibrated based on colors selected by a user. (Yamakawa et al., Col. 14, lines 35-38) (emphasis added). Stated another way, Yamakawa et al. requires consideration of plural colors. Therefore, Yamakawa et al. teaches away from the claimed invention. Further, the absence of any disclosure of detecting minimum pixel values of any single component is not surprising since Yamakawa et al. relates to calibrating a color copier using selected portions of printed images. Thus, while not conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of King et al. and Yamakawa et al. does not disclose at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this Amendment After Final Rejection clearly places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-9-06

By: Michael E. Kondoudis
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501